

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 13 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 13 are amended herein. Claims 4-12 and 14-21 are cancelled herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **SPECIFICATION**

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. In particular, the Examiner has required a new title for the application. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the title herein. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claim 1 stands objected to because of an informality. Claim 13 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 1 and 13 are amended herein. By these amendments, Applicant believes that the objections have been rendered moot. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2-4, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. In particular, the Examiner rejects the claims for failing to include performing a plating process (see page 3 of the Office

Action). Independent claims 2-3 are amended herein to recite “performing a plating process on the land with the resist film formed.” By these amendments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-3 now conform with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim 13 depends on claim 2 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should also now conform with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taguchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,448,504) (a) alone or (b) Kusui (U.S. Pat. No. 6,441,316) in combination with Taguchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,448,504) both (a) or (b) in combination with Hasimoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,642,615). Claims 3, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusui (U.S. Pat. No. 6,441,316) in combination with Taguchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,448,504) further in combination with Hasimoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,642,615). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 3 call for a method of manufacturing a wiring board including a land having a generally rectangular shape including at least one inwardly extending depression formed in a side thereof. The claims further call for a resist film on the land with an opening exposing at least a center of the land and a part of a periphery of the land corresponding to the at least one depression.

Applicants submit that the references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or otherwise suggest a method of manufacturing a wiring board including a land and a

resist film as claimed. In particular, Taguchi and Kusui disclose lands having generally circular shapes without inwardly extending depressions formed in the sides thereof (see, e.g., Figure 3A of the Taguchi reference and Figure 1 of the Kusui reference). Furthermore, a pattern protective film 13 of Taguchi and a photoresist layer 6 of Kusui do not extend onto the lands. For example, the pattern protective film 13 of Taguchi extends onto a wiring pattern 11 and reinforcing patterns 14 connected to land 12.

Hashimoto et al. discloses an electrode 14 with a passivation film 16 formed thereon (see, e.g., Figure 1A of the Hashimoto et al. reference). However, electrode 14 of Hashimoto et al. does not have an inwardly extending depression formed in a side thereof, and, therefore, the opening in the passivation film 16 does not expose a part of a periphery of the electrode 14 corresponding to a depression. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 3 are not obvious in view of the references.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 2 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. As noted above, Applicant has amended claim 2 and respectfully asserts that claim 2 now conforms with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Therefore, claim 2 should now be in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 depends on claim 2 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should also now be in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 27, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley

Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/DWH/pvd